

RECEIVED

JAN 28 1994

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY



Cincinnati Bell  
Telephone®

201 E. Fourth St.  
P. O. Box 2301  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45201

January 27, 1994

**EX PARTE**

Mr. William F. Caton, Acting Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 222  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: CC Docket No. 93-162

Dear Mr. Caton:

On behalf of Cincinnati Bell Telephone Company (CBT), I have enclosed the information requested by Amy Glatter of the Tariff Division of the Common Carrier Bureau. This information is associated with CBT's Direct Case submitted on August 20, 1993.

Two copies of this notice were submitted to the Acting Secretary of the Commission in accordance with Section 1.1206(a)(1) of the Commission's Rules.

Please date-stamp and return the duplicate of this notice to confirm your receipt. Questions regarding this matter should be directed to me at the above address or by calling me at 513-397-7388.

Sincerely,

Alfred J. Titus, Jr.  
Regulatory Affairs

Enclosure

c: Amy Glatter  
Marian Gordon

No. of Copies rec'd 2  
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

JAN 28 1994

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Cincinnati Bell Telephone Company (CBT) is submitting the following clarification

to CBT's answer to Question N of its Direct Case in CC Docket No. 93-162: "Are the LECs provisions regarding letters of agency reasonable?".

CBT will honor letters of agency (LOAs) and bill appropriate charges to third parties if an interconnector so requests, under the following conditions: CBT will bill a circuit provided partially by an interconnector and partially by CBT in a manner that is administratively equivalent to a circuit provided solely by CBT, but only when there are distinct circuit IDs for each part of the circuit(s). CBT cannot, however, currently bill the channel termination, cross-connect, or any other separate parts of the circuit to different parties if all the components of the circuit have the same circuit ID. This is true even when the entire circuit is provided solely by CBT.

Furthermore, in Transmittal No. 642, filed on November 18, 1993, CBT deleted the regulation in Section 17.3(G) of its collocation tariff which required that the interconnector be the sole point of contact.

Cincinnati Bell Telephone Company (CBT) is submitting the following clarification to CBT's answer to Question N of its Direct Case in CC Docket No. 93-162: "Are the LECs provisions regarding letters of agency reasonable?".

CBT will honor letters of agency (LOAs) and bill appropriate charges to third parties if an interconnector so requests, under the following conditions: CBT will bill a circuit provided partially by an interconnector and partially by CBT in a manner that is administratively equivalent to a circuit provided solely by CBT, but only when there are distinct circuit IDs for each part of the circuit(s). CBT cannot, however, currently bill the channel termination, cross-connect, or any other separate parts of the circuit to different parties if all the components of the circuit have the same circuit ID. This is true even when the entire circuit is provided solely by CBT.

Furthermore, in Transmittal No. 642, filed on November 18, 1993, CBT deleted the regulation in Section 17.3(G) of its collocation tariff which required that the interconnector be the sole point of contact.

Cincinnati Bell Telephone Company (CBT) is submitting the following clarification to CBT's answer to Question N of its Direct Case in CC Docket No. 93-162: "**Are the LECs provisions regarding letters of agency reasonable?**".

CBT will honor letters of agency (LOAs) and bill appropriate charges to third parties if an interconnector so requests, under the following conditions: CBT will bill a circuit provided partially by an interconnector and partially by CBT in a manner that is administratively equivalent to a circuit provided solely by CBT, but only when there are distinct circuit IDs for each part of the circuit(s). CBT cannot, however, currently bill the channel termination, cross-connect, or any other separate parts of the circuit to different parties if all the components of the circuit have the same circuit ID. This is true even when the entire circuit is provided solely by CBT.

Furthermore, in Transmittal No. 642, filed on November 18, 1993, CBT deleted the regulation in Section 17.3(G) of its collocation tariff which required that the interconnector be the sole point of contact.

Cincinnati Bell Telephone Company (CBT) is submitting the following clarification to CBT's answer to Question N of its Direct Case in CC Docket No. 93-162: **"Are the LECs provisions regarding letters of agency reasonable?"**.

CBT will honor letters of agency (LOAs) and bill appropriate charges to third parties if an interconnector so requests, under the following conditions: CBT will bill a circuit provided partially by an interconnector and partially by CBT in a manner that is administratively equivalent to a circuit provided solely by CBT, but only when there are distinct circuit IDs for each part of the circuit(s). CBT cannot, however, currently bill the channel termination, cross-connect, or any other separate parts of the circuit to different parties if all the components of the circuit have the same circuit ID. This is true even when the entire circuit is provided solely by CBT.

Furthermore, in Transmittal No. 642, filed on November 18, 1993, CBT deleted the regulation in Section 17.3(G) of its collocation tariff which required that the interconnector be the sole point of contact.